

PARTIES

- D.H. Pierce Design Associates, Inc. d/b/a Pierce Architects ("Pierce"), is a Massachusetts corporation with a principal place of business at 214 Derby Street in Salem, Massachusetts.
- Defendant, D.L. Cote & Company, LLC, is a Massachusetts corporation with a principal place of business at 3 Parker Court in Salem, Massachusetts, and the defendant, Dee L. Cote is an individual with a residential address at 3 Parker Court in Salem, Massachusetts (collectively "Cote").

JURISDICTIONAL ALLEGATIONS

Jurisdiction before this Court is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1338, 17 U.S.C. §102, and 17 U.S.C. §502.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- On December 4, 2003, Cote, acknowledging it owed monies to Pierce for services rendered, provided Pierce with a Promissory Note for \$5,000.00.
- On March 5, 2004, Pierce entered into a Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner and Architect (the "Contract") with Cote in connection with the building known as The Leavitt House Condominiums located at 7 Winter Street in Salem, Massachusetts (the "Project).
- The Contract provided that Pierce would prepare original architectural design documents (hereinafter "Design Documents") for the Project, and perform other specific designated architectural services.

- 7. As stated in the Contract, Pierce retained all rights to the Design Documents, and specifically, all common law and statutory rights, including copyright.
- 8. On June 2, 2004, to accommodate Cote, the Contract was amended by a signed Additional Services Agreement, delineating additional payments to be made to Pierce and establishing a revised total compensation for Pierce's services.
- 9. On August 5, 2004, the parties entered into a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU"). The MOU, which was drafted by George W. Atkins III, Cote's attorney, provided that final payment was due to Pierce no later than June 1, 2005.
- 10. On March 31, 2005, without cause, Cote terminated the Contract with Pierce.
- At all times, Pierce properly and appropriately performed all services called for under its agreements with Cote.
- On April 7, 2005, Pierce issued to Cote Invoice No. 0201.3-15 for fees 12. and expenses totaling \$80,436.72, pursuant the payment terms of the Contract, the Additional Services Agreement, and the MOU (collectively the "Agreements").
- Following Pierce's termination Cote continued to use and directed 13. others to use Pierce's Design Documents without authorization.
- 14. Notwithstanding Cote's continued use of Pierce's Design Documents and Pierce's full compliance with the terms of the Contract and the subsequently executed MOU, Cote has refused to pay Pierce the outstanding monies owed under the Agreements.

Count I - Violation of Copyright

- 15. Pierce repeats and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 14 as if fully set forth herein.
- 16. The Design Documents prepared by Pierce are original architectural works created independently by Pierce and expressing its creative designs.
- 17. Cote knew or should have known that under federal law, the Design Documents are automatically protected by copyright under the Architectural Works Copyright Protection Act as incorporated into 17 U.S.C. § 102.
- Moreover, Pierce has registered these materials with the Library of Congress as his copyright protected works. Pierce's Design Documents were protected against copyright upon the mailing of Form VA(2) for copyright registration with the United States Copyright Office on April 12, 2005.

- 19. After Pierce's termination Cote was expressly advised that Pierce was not relinquishing its ownership or copyright in the Design Documents.
- Despite this knowledge, Cote knowingly and intentionally continues to use the Design Documents without permission of or compensation to Pierce.
- 21. As a result of Cote's violation of Pierce's copyright in the Design Documents, Pierce has been damaged.

WHEREFORE, Pierce requests that judgment enter in his favor against Cote, and that this Court award Pierce its damages, costs, attorney's fees, and such other relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

Count II - Breach of Promissory Note

- 22. Pierce repeats and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 21 as if fully set forth herein.
- 23. On December 4, 2003, Cote provided Pierce a signed Promissory Note which promised to pay \$5,000.00 no later than December 1, 2004.
- 24. Cote has not made payment as required by the terms of the Promissory Note.

WHEREFORE, Pierce requests that judgment enter in his favor against Cote, and that this Court award Pierce its damages, costs, attorney's fees, and such other relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

Count III - Breach of Contract

- 25. Pierce repeats and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 24 as if fully set forth herein.
- 26. Pierce and Cote entered into a written Contract which provided for Cote to pay Pierce for it services as performed on a flat fee basis and an hourly wage after March 5, 2005, plus expenses as identified in the Contract.
- 27. On June 8, 2004 the Contract was amended by an Additional Services Agreement, signed by Cote, delineating payments to be made to Pierce and establishing a total compensation for services, the majority of which would be provided upon completion of the Project.
- 28. On or about July 2004, in violation of the Contract and the Additional Services Agreement, Cote failed to pay Pierce even though Pierce continuously complied with the terms of the agreements.
- 29. On August 5, 2004, an additional agreement was memorialized in a MOU.

- 30. Pierce has performed services and incurred expenses as directed by Cote.
- 31. On March 31, 2005, Cote terminated Pierce's services in violation of the Contract.
- 32. On April 7, 2005, Pierce sent Invoice No. 0201.3-15 to Cote for fees and expenses totaling \$80,436.72 which has not been paid.
- 33. In accordance with the Agreements, final payment for all services rendered was due on June 1, 2005.
 - 34. As a result of Cote's breaches of the Contract, Pierce has been harmed.

WHEREFORE, Pierce requests that judgment enter in its favor against Cote, and that this Court award Pierce its damages pursuant to the Contract, costs, attorney's fees, and such other relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

Count IV - Quantum Meruit

- 35. Pierce repeats and realleges its allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 34 as if fully set forth herein.
- 36. Pierce has performed services and incurred expenses as directed by Cote.
- 37. Despite repeated demands for payment for the work performed and services rendered, Cote has failed to make payment to Pierce.

WHEREFORE, Pierce requests that judgment enter in its favor against Cote, and that this Court award Pierce its damages for services rendered and not compensated, costs, attorney's fees, and such other relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

Count V - Unjust Enrichment

- 38. Pierce repeats and realleges its allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 37 as if fully set forth herein.
- 39. Pierce has performed services and incurred expenses as directed by Cote.
- 40. Cote has received the benefit of Pierce's services and the expenses it incurred on Cote's behalf.
- 41. Cote has failed and refused to make payment to Pierce for the work performed and services provided by Pierce.

WHEREFORE, Pierce requests that judgment enter in its favor against Cote, and that this Court award Pierce its damages for services rendered and not compensated, costs, attorney's fees, and such other relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

Count VI – Statutory - M.G.L. c. 93A

- Pierce repeats and realleges its allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 41 42. as if fully set forth herein.
- 43. At all relevant times, Cote conducted trade or commerce in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts so as to come within the purview of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 93A.
- 44. By its conduct, including, but not limited to, its termination of Pierce's services, unauthorized duplication and continued use of Pierce's Design Documents in violation of Pierce's copyright protection, and refusal to pay Pierce for monies owed, Cote has committed unfair trade practices in violation of M.G.L. c. 93A, §11, and as a direct result thereof, Pierce has incurred monetary damages.
- The unfair and/or deceptive acts or practices by Cote have been committed intentionally and/or recklessly.
- As a result of Cote's unfair and/or deceptive acts or practices, Pierce has suffered and continues to suffer damages.

WHEREFORE, Pierce respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment against Cote in the amount of three times Pierce's damages, plus interest, costs and attorney's fees.

Verification

I, Daniel Pierce, hereby state under oath that the facts asserted herein are true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Daniel H. Pierce

Respectfully submitted

D.H. PIERCE DESIGN ASSOCIATES, INC.

By its attorneys,

MORRISON MATHONEY LLP

Steven J. Bolotin, BBO#564085

250 Summer Street

Boston, MA 02210

(617) 439-7500

JURY DEMAND

Pierce requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted D.H. PIERCE DESIGN ASSOCIATES, INC.

By its attorneys,

MORRISON MAHONEY LLP

Steven J. Bolotin, BBO#564085

250 Summer Street Boston, MA 02210

(617) 439-7500

SS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS											
D.H. Pierce	e Design Associates, Inc.	D.L. Cote	D.L. Cote & Company, LLC and Dee L. Cote,											
	ce Architects	in his ind	in his individual capacity											
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff Essex, MA	County of Residence of	of First Listed Defendant	Essex, MA										
	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)											
			NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE											
			LAND INVOLVED.											
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name.	Address, and Telephone Number) 617-439-750	OO Atorne, (If Kriwn)		HWI.										
Steven J. Bo	olotin, Morrison Mahoney Ll			A Small										
	250 Summer Street, Boston, MA 02210													
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff														
(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defend.														
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	PTF DEF Citizen of This State												
- 11111111	(of Business In Thi											
2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State												
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		of Business In	Another State										
		Citizen or Subject of a	Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6 6											
		Foreign Country												
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES										
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR		☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment										
☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury	- 620 Other Food & Drug	☐ 423 Withdrawal	410 Antitrust										
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractice Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injury		28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce										
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability	☐ 630 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 460 Deportation										
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander	al 640 R.R. & Truck 550 Airline Regs.	■ 820 Copyrights ■ 830 Patent	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit										
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability Liability	☐ 660 Occupational	☐ 840 Trademark											
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER ☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud	Safety/Health 690 Other	}	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 810 Selective Service										
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 371 Truth in Lending	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/										
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	□ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 380 Other Personal □ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage	☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts										
☐ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability	e 🗍 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))											
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	360 Other Personal Product Liability Injury	730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XV! ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))											
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO	NS 740 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act										
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vaca ☐ 442 Employment Sentence	te 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act										
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	Security Act	☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	☐ 895 Freedom of Information										
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations 530 General 535 Death Penalty		26 USC 7609	Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination										
290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer, w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus & Ot	her		Under Equal Access										
	Employment 550 Civil Rights 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 555 Prison Condition		ĺ	to Justice 950 Constitutionality of										
	Other	`	}	State Statutes										
	440 Other Civil Rights		<u> </u>	<u></u>										
V. ORIGIN (Place	an "X" in One Box Only)	_		Appeal to District										
XD1 Original D2 R	emoved from 3 Remanded from	3 4 Reinstated or 5 Transf	ferred from	ict 7 Judge from Magistrate										
	tate Court Appellate Court	Reopened (speci		Judgment										
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 17 U.S.C. Sec. 501 et.	sed -	al statutes unless diversity):											
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of cause:													
	Breach of copyright and	<u>d contract and unf</u>	air business pr	actice										
VII. REQUESTED IN	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND\$ 125,00	O CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:										
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		JURY DEMAND:	XO Yes □ No										
VIII. RELATED CASE	(See instructions):		BACKETS III.											
IF ANY JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER														
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNEY OF RECORD												
814105	Cottenda	et												
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY														

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

1.			of first party or		D.H. Pi	erce Des	sign A	ssociat	es, Inc.	ν
	D.L.	Cote	Company,	LLC_						
2	Category i	n which	the case belong	s based upon th	ne numbered na	ature of suit	code liste	d on the civ	il cover sheet	(See local
-	Category in which the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See local rule 40.1(a)(1)).									
			160, 410, 470, 5	35, R.23, REGAF	RDLESS OF NA	TURE OF SU	ит.			
	X	l.		00, 440, 441-446 20*, 830*, 840*, 8					te AO 120 or ademark or c	AO 121 opyright cases
		II.		40, 151, 190, 210 40, 345, 350, 355 91.						
		V.		30, 460, 480, 490 65, 870, 871, 875		620 630 64	0, 650, 66	,		and the state of t
		<i>l</i> .	150, 152, 153.						ا لسله ا	- TIN
3.			f any, of related cate the title and					r related ca	se has been f	iled in this
4.	Has a prio	r action	between the san	ne parties and b	ased on the sa		·		-	
						Y	ES	NO	X	
5.	Does the o	omplain	t in this case qu	estion the cons	titutionality of a	in act of con	gress affe	cting the pu	blic interest?	(See 28 USC
	,	e U.S.A.	or an officer, age	ent or employee	of the U.S. a pa		ES	NO	X	
					·	Y	ES	NO	X	
6.	Is this cas	e require	d to be heard ar	nd determined b	y a district cou	rt of three ju	dges purs	uant to title	28 USC §228	4?
						Y	ES	NO	X	
7.	Do <u>all</u> of th Massachu	ne partie: setts ("g	s in this action, overnmental ag	excluding gove encies"), residi	rnmental agend ng in Massachu	ies of the ur setts reside	ited states in the san	s and the Co ne division?	ommonwealth - (See Local	of Rule 40.1(d)).
						Y	ES X	NO		
		۸.	lf yes, in which	division do <u>all</u> o	f the non-gove	nmental par	ties reside	?	***************************************	
			Eastern Division	n X	Central I	Division		Wes	tern Division	
	E		lf no, in which d residing in Mass			laintiffs or th	e only par	ties, exclud	ing governm	ental agencies,
			Eastern Division	1	Central I	Division [770000000	Wes	tern Division	
8.			Removal - are the		s pending in the	state court	requiring	the attentio	n of this Cou	t? (If yes,
						Y	ES	NO		
(PL	EASE TYPE	OR PR	NT)			/24				
•	TORNEY'S		Steve	n J. Bolo				oney LL	P 	
ADI	DRESS	<u>_</u>	250 S	ummer Str	eet, Bost	on, MA (02210			
TEI	EPHONE N	ю	617-4	39-7500						
									(CategoryForr	n.wpd - 5/2/05)